

without extraneous amendments that have nothing to do with the issue before us. We can do this bill with a good day of hard work.

I thank the majority leader for bringing up the bill again, for recognizing its importance, and for working with the four managers of the bill to try to find a path forward. But we need cooperation from our colleagues and from the leaders on the other side of the aisle if we are going to be successful in doing so. I am convinced, as is the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, that in a day's time we can complete action on this bill and be on our way to conference with the House if we have a little cooperation from our colleagues.

Let's not fail this test. Let's not fail to get this job done. This matters. It matters because if we do not have the support of the American people, the trust and confidence of the American people, then we cannot tackle the major issues facing this country.

This bill would be a significant step forward in repairing the frayed bonds between the American people and their Government at a time when surveys indicate that trust in Congress is perilously low.

I hope we can come together. This is a bipartisan effort. Senator SANTORUM convened a bipartisan task force that has worked very hard and gave rise to many of the bipartisan principles upon which this bill is based. Let us work together on both sides of the aisle. We have bipartisan support. With the ranking Democrats, Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator DODD, with the two chairmen, Senator LOTT and myself, we can get this job done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANDREW H. CARD, JR.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to praise and thank Secretary Card who, for the last 5½ years, served as Chief of Staff for the President of the United States. Those of us from New Hampshire, such as the Senator in the Chair, know Andy Card well. Long before he became Chief of Staff, before he became Secretary of Transportation, before he even went into the White House with the first President Bush, he was an individual who had a fair amount of presence in New Hampshire. He started out in Massachusetts in the State legislature. There, with a small band of Republican members of that body in the 1970s, those of us who were in government in New Hampshire had a chance to meet him on occasion as a neighbor and fellow legislator and member of the government.

Then, in 1987, I believe it was, he came to New Hampshire and basically

took up residence on a cot in a run-down building that we used as the headquarters for the George H. Bush campaign for President. He was the field director, the campaign manager under Governor Sununu and under my father, Governor Gregg. He, at that time, created a tremendous amount of goodwill amongst those who had a chance to work with him. He was an extraordinarily highly capable individual who got his job done, did it without ego but did it very effectively.

That approach, which grew with experience both as a Deputy Chief of Staff with the first President Bush and then as Transportation Secretary, and now as Chief of Staff since the beginning of this administration—that approach of a quiet, confident, unassuming but extraordinarily effective individual has been really his *modus operandi*. He has really set a standard, I believe, to which Chiefs of Staff will be held as we go forward from administration to administration.

The job of Chief of Staff is one of the most difficult jobs there is in Washington, obviously. It is a high-intensity position requiring workdays that often run into 20 hours. It requires that you know all the issues, that you know who the players are, that you put out the fires, that you communicate effectively, that you be courteous to people who may not be so courteous to you, and that you deal effectively with getting the President of the United States the information he needs in order to do his job. Andy Card, as I said, set a standard which will be one which I think Chiefs of Staff to come will try to equal.

He is always fair. He is always open. He is low key, unassuming, extraordinarily effective but firm when he had to be on issues and with people relative to carrying out the policy of the President. As he said today at the ceremony at the White House, he always recognized the fact that he was a staffer. He was not an elected official as a Chief of Staff, but he was a staffer who worked for the President of the United States and that his job was to carry forward the policies of the President. He did that extraordinarily well.

His wife, of course, has been with him all these years and put up with the thousands of hours he has not been at home since he has done this job—his wife Kathleene. As she has ministered to people who attend their church and others, she has certainly been a soulmate and person of strength for Andy Card.

We bid him a sort of a bittersweet farewell in that I know he will be missed in that position, but he has certainly earned the right to move on to take some time for himself and his family, to be able to get up in the morning and be able to enjoy the day without having to know that he will be rushing off for a 20-hour day at the White House.

I suspect he will be returning to New England. We look forward to having

him back. I know he will spend a fair amount of time in Massachusetts and a fair amount of time in Maine, and I am sure he is going to stop on his way between Massachusetts and Maine to take advantage of New Hampshire's "no sales tax" climate. He is a special person, and the country has been well served by having him.

His successor, Josh Bolten, I have had the good fortune of dealing with also for a number of years but especially in the last few years as Director of OMB. In my role as chairman of the Budget Committee, he is obviously the person I have had the most contact with in the administration. Interestingly enough, he brings a lot of the same characteristics to the job Andy Card does. He is low key, he is bright, has a great sense of humor, and he understands that his job is to carry forward the mission of and purposes of the President.

He is a person you can talk to, who enjoys listening, will reach out, and does reach out for and has reached out as Director of OMB to Members of the Senate to hear their thoughts and ideas as to how we should proceed.

He has tremendous respect, I believe, on both sides of the aisle in the way he has led the OMB, and he will create a seamless transition in the White House as he moves over to the chief of staff job.

We are fortunate to have people such as this—people such as Andy Card and Josh Bolten who are willing to take on the obligation of public service and serve in positions such as Chief of Staff for the President, jobs which are extraordinarily intense and involve tremendous sacrifice relative to family. But without good people such as this willing to do them, the Nation would be much less.

We thank Andy Card for his service. We wish him and Kathleene good luck and good fortune as they move forward, and we welcome Josh Bolten to the job.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended and that I be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INTEGRITY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I do not anticipate taking the full 15 minutes,

but I did want to alert my colleagues to an amendment that I believe will be coming up this afternoon, or perhaps even later this morning. In any event, later today Senators MCCAIN, LIEBERMAN, and I will be offering an amendment to the ethics bill before us to create an Office of Public Integrity.

The American people view the way that we enforce ethics requirements on each other and on our staff as an inherently conflicted process. We set our own rules, we are our own advisers, we are our own investigators, we are our own prosecutors, we are our own judges, and we are our own juries. Even though we have some of our finest Members serving on the Ethics Committee, they cannot escape the perception that the process is plagued by conflict of interest. We do have extraordinary capable, ethical individuals serving on the Ethics Committee in the Senate. We are very fortunate to have a committee that works in harmony and that takes its job very seriously.

I believe we can preserve the important role of the Ethics Committee—and it is a vital role because the Constitution requires each House of Congress to discipline its own Members, if necessary, and we are going to preserve that absolutely critical role—but that we can make an improvement in the process by creating a congressional office, the Office of Public Integrity.

I emphasize this is part of the legislative branch. We are not talking, as some have, about creating an outside commission of judges and former Members of Congress and ethics experts. We are talking about recognizing that the Constitution clearly places responsibility within the legislative branch for taking actions, if necessary, against its own Members who violate the House or Senate rules. But we believe that process would be enhanced if we create an office of public integrity. It would be headed by a director who would be appointed by the majority and minority leaders of the Senate. That office would conduct investigations of possible ethics violations independent of any direct supervision by the Senate. So we would be assured that the public would perceive the process—the investigation—as more credible than now occurs when the Ethics Committee is investigating allegations against their colleagues.

I wish to point out, however, this is not the Shays-Meehan bill in the House, whatever the merits of that approach. This is a different approach from that taken by the Senator from Illinois, Senator OBAMA, and it is even different from the proposal Senator LIEBERMAN and I advanced in the Homeland Security markup. We have refined it still further. We narrowed the authority of the Office of Public Integrity, and I think we struck exactly the right balance between the duties of this office and the duties of the Ethics Committee. This office would conduct impartial, independent, thorough investigations and report its findings to

the Ethics Committee which then would retain authority to rule on the cases and allegations and decide what action, if any, is taken. This would enhance the public confidence that this investigation would be an independent one.

It is very difficult for us to investigate ourselves. There are friendships, there are inherent conflicts of interest. The Ethics Committee does a terrific job in the Senate. It has wonderful members serving on it, individuals of the highest integrity. But the public perception is always going to be that this is an inherently conflicted process because we are investigating ourselves. We are playing every role in the process. What we are trying to do is create an office that would conduct the investigation.

I know many of our colleagues are not comfortable with this concept. Some of them have compared it to the old special prosecutor laws. But that is not what we are doing. We are very carefully setting up a system of checks and balances with the Ethics Committee retaining all of the final authority to decide how to proceed, to decide whether subpoenas should be employed, to decide whether an investigation should go forward in the first place, and to decide the ultimate disposition of the case. The investigation would be done by this independent office.

I point out to my colleagues one of the advantages of having an independent Office of Public Integrity conduct the investigation. The public now is often skeptical of the findings and actions taken by the Ethics Committee. If the Office of Public Integrity comes to the Ethics Committee and says these allegations have been thoroughly investigated, we, an independent entity, have investigated these allegations and we find there is no truth to them, that finding is much more likely to be accepted by the public if the investigation is done by this independent office. It would have complete credibility. That would be a great advantage. It would remove the cloud of doubt and suspicion that often hangs over Members of Congress unfairly when allegations are made against them.

The reason the public often has those doubts is they know we are investigating ourselves. They know our colleagues are investigating allegations against their colleagues.

If we insert this Office of Public Integrity into the process, public confidence in the thoroughness, independence, and credibility of the investigations would be enhanced. It would in no way diminish the authority of the Ethics Committee to take the action, make the final judgments, and indeed judgments all along the way, on this case.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ELIMINATING SECRET HOLDS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am hopeful that shortly the Senate will be voting on a measure that will take a very significant step forward by bringing sunshine and public accountability to the Senate.

If you walk the streets of this country and ask someone what a hold is in the Senate, I don't think you will get 1 out of 100 people who will have any idea what you are talking about. But the fact of the matter is, a hold in the Senate is the ability to block a piece of legislation, block a nomination from being even discussed in the Senate. As a result of a hold, the Senate will not even get a peek at a topic that may involve millions of our citizens, billions of dollars, and affect the quality of life of citizens in every corner of the land.

It would be one thing if the Senator who exercises this extraordinary tool—this tool that carries so much power with it—if that Senator would exercise the tool in public and could be held accountable. Unfortunately, holds are now placed in secret. They are done behind closed doors. The sponsor of a piece of legislation will not even know about it. It seems to me a Senate that is serious about lobbying reform absolutely must stop doing so much of its important business in secret, behind closed doors.

I will offer later in the day, I hope, with Senator GRASSLEY, Senator INHOFE, and Senator SALAZAR, an amendment to bring a bit of sunshine to the Senate. It is an amendment that would not abolish the hold. Senators' rights would be fully protected. Senator COLLINS is in the Senate, and as a result of the colloquy we had several weeks ago, this legislation also protects the Senator's right to be consulted on a piece of legislation. Certainly, that is something all Members feel is important. If there are bills that affect a Senator's State or that they have a great interest in, that Senator would have an opportunity to study the legislation and to reflect on what it means.

What we say in this bipartisan amendment is when a Senator digs in, when a Senator plans to exercise this extraordinary power, the power to block a bill or a nomination from ever being heard, we are saying that Senator has got to be held publicly accountable. What we require is that a Senator who exercises a hold would have to so state in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They could still use their procedural rights to make sure they have a chance to oppose the legislation and to oppose it strongly, but they would be identified as the person who was so objecting.

The intelligence reauthorization bill is now being prevented from coming to this Senate as a result of a secret hold.